

CITY OF BELMONT
PLANNING COMMISSION
ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2008, 7:00 PM

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Horton, Mercer, Mayer McKenzie, Frautschi
Commissioners Absent: Reed

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), Senior Planner DiDonato (SP), Associate Planner Walker (AP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS – None

3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) - None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

4A. Minutes of August 19, 2008

MOTION: By Vice Chair Horton, seconded by Commissioner Frautschi, to accept the Minutes of August 19, 2008 as presented.

Ayes: Horton, Frautschi, Mayer, McKenzie, Mercer, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Reed

Motion passed 6/0

5. OLD BUSINESS

5A. 1114 Ladera Way – Landscape Plan

SP DiDonato summarized the Staff Memorandum, recommending approval of the plan as proposed.

Commissioner Mercer expressed concern that the existing tall trees could be damaged by adding the proposed fern and crepe myrtle trees underneath them. She believed the added trees could be eliminated so long as there is a stand of tall trees on the left side of the driveway and the ash continues to flourish. Commissioner Frautschi suggested that they let the landscape architect determine if it is too crowded.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Vice Chair Horton, to adopt the Resolution approving the Final Landscape/Irrigation Plan for 1114 Ladera Way (Appl. No. 2008-0003) with the option of the owner and landscape architect to determine whether or not they want to keep the fern pines.

Ayes: Frautschi, Horton, Mercer, Mayer, McKenzie, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Reed

Motion passed 6/0/1

6. STUDY SESSION

6A. PRELIMINARY DESIGN REVIEW – Vacant Lot on Lower Lock Avenue

The applicant(s) requests Preliminary Design Review for the construction a new 4,450 sq. ft. single-family home on a vacant, 11-acre lot (Application. No.: 2008-0042).

APN: 043-042-430; Zoned: HRO-1 (Hillside Residential and Open Space)

Applicant: Topos Architects

Owner(s): Scott and Mary Piazza

SP DiDonato summarized the staff memorandum, asking for Commissioners' comments on the appropriateness of the proposed project for the site, and reminded them that they are under no obligation to comment on the project. He added that answers to questions that had been received from a Commissioner before the meeting were placed on the dais, as well as a sample fire management and vegetation plan and an explanation of the reference to animal-friendly fencing.

SP DiDonato responded to Commissioners' questions about the site as follows:

- There are two parts to the project site – approximately 10 acres zoned HRO-1 and 1 acre zoned HRO-2 that consists of 8 lots that were merged in 2002, for a total of about 11 acres.
- The 13 acres referred to in the applicant's cover memo may be a more exact measurement and may include additional properties owned by the owner that are not part of this project.
- The easement would include some of the previous lots that were originally individual lots.
- His understanding is that all of the area will be turned over to a conservation easement, but the applicant could clarify that.
- The reason for a driveway easement across property that is owned by one owner is that merging properties in separate zoning districts would have been quite problematic. Therefore, instead of merging the properties the simplest way was to grant himself an easement across the property. CA Zafferano interjected that the question as to why the applicant would want an easement over the property instead of merging the whole thing should be deferred to the applicant.

- The balance of Lower Lock Grove is a paper road as it goes past this property – there is no developed road to get to the subject properties. The only portion that has been developed is the 25' sliver that provides access to this driveway easement.
- Infrastructure requirements for sewers, gutters, etc., are not part of the Preliminary Design Review.

Peter Baltay, principal architect, addressed the Commission. He extended his gratitude to CA Zafferano, SP DiDonato and CDD de Melo for their time and help. He gave an overview of the history and ownership of the lots, stressing that it is the Piazzas intention to build a single home on the property and that they have offered to dedicate a conservation easement over their property. They have no intentions, hopes or aspirations for any sort of commercial gain. They had distributed over 350 flyers to neighbors and held a neighborhood outreach meeting where they showed all comers the plans and toured the property, and where they heard a lot of positive feedback. He believed the San Juan Hills neighborhood will gladly support the project and that the open space conservation easement will provide a true and fair benefit to the community. Using photographs, he described the planned location for the house, noting that their objective is to minimize tree removal, have a complete balance of cut and fill, and minimize the impacts on neighbors. He stated that he felt that the project complies with the letter and spirit of the San Juan Hills Area Plan as well as all the Belmont zoning ordinances, adding that there are no variances, exceptions or special findings required and that they want to work cooperatively to make the project a success for the entire town.

Mindy Romanowsky, and land use attorney, gave a brief overview of her role and goals, which were to keep the project within the confines of the zoning and the San Juan Hills Area Plan, and something that would be acceptable in the community and overcome some hurdles with access and conservation. Regarding access, she stated that after much study and surveys they believe that there is sufficient access where they would not need to extend the road. Because they are in two separate zones it made sense to put an easement over the lower parcel; even though it is the same owner, there are estate planning issues. She believed it is a smart thing to do when talking about two parcels, particularly in two separate zones. She added that she was willing to consider removing the easement if it makes the Commission uncomfortable. Regarding the conservation easement, she stated that the Piazzas intend to put a conservation easement over the 10 acres. They hadn't thought about the lower parcel because this is an application to develop the big parcel with the one home and she understands that the lower parcel is highly sloped and within a geologic hazard zone and that nothing could be put on it in the future. The conservation easement would have language in it that would protect and preserve the real character of the property and would encourage the Piazzas to be the stewards of this land. She stated that the 1-acre HRO-2 lot is not a part of the application, adding that it is her understanding that it cannot be built upon anyway. SP DiDonato distributed a copy of the geologic hazard policy map showing that it is in a hazardous area.

Rinata Showberg, Belmont property owner, asked what the conservation easement will mean to the people of Belmont; i.e., will they be able to walk on it, will it be like a park? Ms Romanowsky responded that it will continue to be private property – the public will not be allowed on it but the plan is to install animal-friendly fencing so that the animals can roam freely. The Piazzas are granting the easement so that the community at large will have the comfort to know that the land

will not be subdivided or become commercial. Responding to a question from the audience, Ms. Romanowsky stated that the findings of the recent survey had been recorded.

Commissioner McKenzie asked if agriculture and horseback riding, for example, would be allowed uses under the conservation easement. SP DiDonato responded that the exact language or intent of the owners had not yet been submitted. Staff is requesting that the applicant define a maximum developable area for the property so they know exactly what will be developed and what will be left in its natural state.

Michelle Meliska, Belmont resident, thanked the Piazzas for being very collegial and open and for trying to do everything they can to make as little impact on the neighborhood as possible. She asked that consideration be given in the long-term planning to not just the placement of the home but the impact of noise when building the home and the time it will take to build the structure. She called attention to the fact that the recent survey shows that about 10' of what the Meliska's thought was their property may in fact be owned by the Piazzas. They are investigating through their title insurance company and looking at their legal rights both with the previous seller and their realtor. Regarding access, she advised that in order to have a secure yard for their children they will be putting a gate in front of their home; cars will no longer be able to use their driveway to turn around and it will not be accessible to construction vehicles.

Commissioners' comments were as follows:

Commissioner Mercer:

- Had concerns about building on this property at all until Mr. Piazza met her at the site, and on close inspection she concluded that the front of the proposed site is buildable and considered stable enough to build on.
- Pleased that there would be a zero net cut and fill and that the drainage issues have been addressed.
- Would love to see the entire area preserved, but it is a private property and believed it is a tremendous trade-off for the City to see one very well done and very well placed home in exchange for permanently preserving the rest of the canyon.

Commissioner McKenzie:

- Concurred with Commissioner Mercer and believed that using this type of land and still preserving the open space is about as good as could be expected.
- Had a bit of a problem with the design of the home – thought it is not exactly in character with the rest of the homes in the neighborhood in that it is a rather stark contrast. He would like to see it softened somehow.

Vice Chair Horton:

- Believed that the land use is appropriate for the site, the intensity of use is appropriate for the site, and that the house is where it needs to be.
- Wished the City had been able to purchase the property and make it a park but it is private property and the tradeoff for preserving the property is a good one.

Commissioner Mayer:

- A win/win for Belmont; well-planned and well thought out.
- Only concern was that the merged lot in the HRO-2 zone was not included in the open space easement. Just because it is technically undevelopable does not mean that it could not at some point be developed by somebody with the desire and ambition to do so.
- Agreed with Commissioner McKenzie that the scale and design as they've seen it is a bit out of scale for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Frautschi:

- Could find for all three of the questions asked by staff.
- The siting of the house is probably perfect, but believed it is the location that reduces the length of the driveway the most.
- Liked that the location of the house provides the least impact on heritage species trees.
- Even though there are only 8 trees being removed and they might be below the size that requires replacement, he hoped that the applicant would consider replacing them on a 3-to-1 ratio.
- Thought the stone base on the house was a good idea because it is in a wildfire area.
- Hoped that the City and the applicant could come up with a roundabout turn radius circle at the end of Lower Lock because it is a very tight place to turn around and it would increase the safety of the neighborhood.
- The design is interesting. He did not think it necessarily reflects the neighborhood but there are a lot of ways to reflect the neighborhood – it could be done with materials.
- Would expect a lot of detail and could not envision a house that appears like a baseball stadium as far as light flowing off it.
- Would feel more comfortable if the applicant would consider the HRO-2 properties as an integral part of this HRO-1 as far as setting aside the property in a merged fashion as a conservation easement. He noted that there have been three occasions on the Planning Commission where geologists approached them to change the designation from something that couldn't be built on to something that could be built on.
- Regarding the driveway easement, he would prefer that it be recorded. He cited a personal experience where his parents had to come up with a substantial amount of money to buy an easement to get across property that they had been crossing for 20 years after it changed ownership.

Chair Parsons:

- Also had concerns about keeping the parcels along the paper road out of the conservation easement; thought that should be looked into.
- It would be nice if they could find a way to make some of the currently used trails available to the public but appreciated that the owners would have concerns about fire danger, etc.
- Looked forward to seeing what the architecture is going to look like and hoped it would be green friendly.
- Hoped that the applicant and the neighbor would work together to resolve the property line dispute and the layout of the house.

Chair Parsons called a short break at 8:05 p.m.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

7A. PUBLIC HEARING – LOT 52 NAUGHTON AVENUE

The applicants request Single Family Design Review approval to construct a new 2,397 square-foot single family residence on an existing vacant lot on W. Naughton Avenue that is below the maximum permitted 2,400 square feet for the site.(Appl. No. 2008-0035)

APN: 043-104-560; Zoned: HRO-2 (Hillside Residential and Open Space - Subdivided)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicants: Kenneth Hall on behalf of Michael Yurovitsky

Owners: MYREI LLC.

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report and referred Commissioners to a paper that had been placed on the dais with minor modifications to the Conditions of Approval for this project and item 7B. Staff supported the project request and recommended adoption of the resolution and conditions of approval.

AP Walker deferred Commissioner Mercer's question about which property is being more heavily cut or filled to the applicant.

Commissioner Mayer asked for clarification of the easement to the open space. AP Walker explained that the steep slope in the rear and side areas of Lot 52 prohibits usable open space, and the granting of a private open space easement allows the developers of Lot 52 to extend their on-grade stone patio. She added that when the four lots were reconfigured as part of a lot line adjustment request, the square footage from this original parcel was distributed into the more sensitive and sloped areas along the edges of the property, thus creating one more usable property – Parcel A.

Vice Chair Horton questioned why there has to be an easement. She felt it was odd to start off with an easement for a back yard and wondered why one parcel was not made to follow the land it needed. CDD de Melo suggested that that question was best answered by the property owner.

Commissioner Frautschi asked if it could be that they are doing an easement because if they did a lot line adjustment giving the property away they would lose the potential to create 3500 sq.ft. on one piece of property. CDD de Melo responded that he believed this home would be able to get the 3500 sq.ft. even if that sliver was taken out.

Ken Hall, applicant and architect, stated that they could have reconfigured the lots and still have access to 3500 sq.ft. but they were trying to work within the City's mechanisms for maintaining the largest parcel and use the floor area transfer process, disturbing as few historical lot lines as possible. He stated that the owners intend to occupy the larger parcel and sell the smaller home. For Lot A, the cut is 99.5 cubic yards and the fill is 90.5 cubic yards for a total of 190 with 9 cubic yards that would need to be off hauled. Most of the cut was to site the house as low as possible. The fill for the other lot is 84 cubic yards and the cut is 111 cubic yards for a total of 195 cubic yards, which enables the smaller home to have a larger, more usable area to the south. Reducing five lots to two buildable lots with the conservation easement reduced the density of the parcels and provides more uniform shaped parcels with buffers between the existing homes to the south and the newly proposed homes on the site. His goal in siting the homes was to try to minimize the

view blockage from Naughton Avenue and staggering the homes helped support that goal. He believed the materials and color are very indicative of the neighborhood. Regarding the massing, he tried to vary the façades by stepping back the upper floor as much as possible and by creating detail at the garage area and around the northern side of the building. The landscaping plan was done in such a way as to shield the lower parts of the home from the neighbors on the other side of Naughton Avenue but not create view blockage for pedestrians along the street or the occupants of the home in question.

The applicant clarified for Commissioner Frautschi that there would not be any stone on the house under discussion and that the retaining wall would be coated with stucco to match the house. Commissioner Frautschi suggested that they consider using low water ground cover instead of the proposed bark due to the high winds in the area.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing. There were no speakers.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 6/0/1 by a show of hands.

Commissioners commented as follows:

Commissioner Mercer:

- Asked that the record clearly indicate that the reason that this home is able to be built to this size is because of the development potential granted off of the “L” shaped conservation easement. The calculated FAR of .471 is not something that the Commission would normally approve in this area, but when the development potential is added in, the FAR is .276. It does not mean every lot can be developed with that FAR.
- Some of the findings were a close call:
 - She found the house to be rather boxy and bulky. On the east elevation on the right-hand side, she would like to have seen the house stepped down further, even if it was just two or three feet, so that it conformed to the land even more.
 - Because the house consumes such a large portion of its lot, she was concerned about water run-off from the proposed concrete driveway and would like to see something more permeable. She envisioned the river that is going to run onto Naughton Avenue in a heavy rain.

Vice Chair Horton:

- The house conforms to the neighborhood.
- Only issue is with the fit. She suggested that perhaps at some time they might consider a lot line adjustment to not have an easement.
- She could make the findings.

Commissioner Mayer:

- Could make all of the findings.
- Agreed with Commissioner Mercer about the bulk of the building and that it would have been nicer to see more of a step down to conform to the land a little more.
- Does not like the easement in the back.

Commissioner Frautschi:

- The house fits with the neighborhood. There are a lot of large uninteresting houses in this part of town and this kind of adds to it.
- The inside of the house is clever and a nicely laid out plan.
- Agreed that the easement is weird and could foresee problems with future buyers.
- Did not like the finding that “all unplanted open ground will be covered with shredded bark or chipped bark mulch.” He believed that bark is not a permanent solution for uncovered spaces and that the Commission should require some kind of ground cover, which is just as cost effective as bark.
- Could have been more generous with trees. He believed the applicant needed to include some native species as they do really well, and suggested that the Western Redbud does not get very large and will not do well in the windy conditions.
- It is a win/win that they have gone from five potential lots to two.
- Suggested that they should try to keep the nine cubic yards of fill on the property.

Commissioner McKenzie:

- Responding to the architect’s comment that one of the objectives was to keep the design consistency of the neighborhood, he found that more of that design may be a bit overwhelming; all of West Naughton Avenue looks the same. He encouraged a little variety in color schemes and a tile roof, etc., so the street does not look like a planned subdivision.
- Other than that comment, could make all the findings and could support it.

Chair Parsons:

- Asked CDD de Melo if they could make it a condition of approval to require that the lot line be adjusted so as to not have to deal with an easement. CDD de Melo responded that the concern is that that any reconfigured lot via the lot line adjustment process must be at least 10,000 square feet. If they were to give up potentially 400 square feet or more it would then run contrary to the provisions of the HRO-2 district for floor area transfers via lot line adjustments. The configured lot is 10,166 sq.ft., so if the patio portion that they would confer via the lot line adjustment exceeds 166 square feet they would run contrary to the section on lot line adjustments. Staff can continue to do research, but making it a condition of approval would be onerous based on this section of the zoning code. Chair Parsons said that he would like to see it happen if it can be done – it would make for a cleaner project for both properties and potentially better neighbors.
- Also had concerns about the runoff, especially on the driveway, and suggested that pavers might be a better solution.
- Suggested that they take a relook at their landscape plan in terms of some of the trees and come back with more native trees.
- Agreed with Commissioner Frautschi that bark will blow everywhere and is not the solution.
- Could otherwise make the findings.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review for Lot 52 (APN 043-107-560) Naughton Avenue (Appl. No. 2008-0035) with Exhibit A, Conditions of Approval, and that a landscape plan and a driveway surfacing plan other

than concrete come back to the Commission, and with the Conditions of Approval attached and modifications to Conditions I.A.7, I.A.8, II.B.14, and II.B.16 as set forth by staff memo.

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, Mercer, McKenzie, Horton, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Reed

Motion passed 6/0/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to the City Council within 10 calendar days.

Chair Parsons confirmed for the applicant that he can work with staff to modify the landscape and driveway plans.

7B. PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED PARCEL A NAUGHTON AVENUE

The applicants request Single Family Design Review approval to construct a new 3,496 square-foot single family residence on a newly created vacant parcel on W. Naughton Avenue that is below the maximum permitted 3,500 square feet for the site.(Appl. No. 2008-0034)

APN: 043-104-540, 043-104-550, 43-104-570, 043-104-580);

Zoned: HRO-2 (Hillside Residential and Open Space - Subdivided)

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicants: Kenneth Hall on behalf of Michael Yurovitsky

Owners: Anna Leydermann and Michael Yurovitsky

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report, recommending approval of the application with the Conditions of Approval attached.

Responding to Commissioner Mercer's request for clarification of the Parcel B L-shaped Open Space Conservation Easement, AP Walker stated that there is a lot line recorded and both lots are owned by the same property owner. A conservation easement was recorded by the City Council and part of the lot transfer process and conservation easement recordation process require the management plan for a vacant parcel, so the management plan that was agreed upon for this was that it be incorporated in the private rear and side yard area. It is a separate parcel but the property owner for Parcel A is responsible for Parcel B.

Kenneth Hall, applicant, stated that his narrative for this home would be similar to the preceding presentation. Therefore, to save time he chose not to go into details but was available to answer questions.

Responding to Commissioner Frautschi's questions, Mr. Hall stated that there are no retaining walls in the driveway and the existing curb cut will be filled in and shifted about 6'.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing.

Laura Schulte, Belmont resident, called attention to a project across the street from these projects that has been under construction for about two years and is only half done, and stated that as a nearby resident she would appreciate it if there were a timeline cap on the construction of these two homes. CDD de Melo responded that the City adopted a construction time limit ordinance earlier in the year that caps the construction time, after issuance of the building permit, to approximately 12 months for a single-family room addition and 24 months for a new home. Ms. Schulte's question as to whether these homes were going to be built sequentially or simultaneously should be asked of the applicant.

MOTION: By Commissioner Frautschi, seconded by Vice Chair Horton, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 6/0/1 by voice vote.

Vice Chair Horton and Commissioner Mayer stated that they could make the findings and had no issues with this project.

Commissioner Frautschi could make all the findings if they include the proposed new conditions. He was satisfied with the landscape plan and thought the Olive and Manzanita trees were good choices.

Commissioner Mercer stated that the bulk was a close call, but could make the findings because of the addition of the strong wording to make sure that the uninhabitable areas remain that way. She noted that the driveway is not as pronounced a slope as the other driveway but strongly suggested that the owner consider doing a paver as an aesthetic upgrade that would complement the stone.

Commissioner McKenzie could make all the findings and thought it was a nice package with the other house – they fit well together on the panoramic view building site.

Chair Parsons concurred that the driveway should be done in pavers as it would make the value of the house look better and would cut back on the runoff onto the street.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Horton, seconded by Commissioner McKenzie, to adopt the Resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review for Proposed Parcel A (APN's 043-104-540, 043-105-550, 043-104-570, 043-104-570 and 043-104-580) Naughton Avenue (Appl. No. 2008-0034) with the Conditions of Approval attached and modifications to Conditions I.A.7, I.A.8, II.B.14, II.B.16 and I.A.10 as called out by staff memo.

Ayes: Horton, McKenzie, Mercer, Mayer, Frautschi, Parsons
Noes: None
Absent: Reed

Motion passed 6/0/1

Chair Parsons announced that this project may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

8. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES:

8A. Motel 6 – 1101 Shoreway Road

CA Zafferano reported that at the next City Council meeting a draft ordinance will be presented that looks at whether the City can require safety plans and those types of things from property owners who require an extraordinary number of police and fire calls during a defined period of time. He added that the City cannot charge for these services – that's what tax dollars are for – but the City may be able to do some things over and above that.

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

8B. NDNU (Koret) Athletic Field

Working on scheduling a meeting of the Athletic Field Task Force within the next 2 weeks.

8C. Charles Armstrong School – 1405 Solana Drive

Will be getting together all of the groups that were in the meeting on 8/5 as well as adding members of the Parks & Rec staff and the Commission.

8D. Ralston/US-101 Landscape Project

No new update.

8E. Peet's Center – 1250 El Camino Real

Will be contacting the property owner about some sort of management plan.

Chair Parsons called attention to a stretch of road between the two hedges that is coming up and needs repaired.

8F. Emmett House

Plans expected to be received by end of the following week, so that meeting could possibly occur during the week of 9/29.

8G. San Mateo Development – North Road/43rd Avenue

AP Walker is working with Belmont's Public Works Department as well as the San Mateo Planning office to gather information. AP Walker added that Belmont's street records do not include improvements for the San Mateo side of North Road; they know what was planned on the Belmont side when the original subdivision took place but have not been able to locate details for the other side. Staff is trying to obtain a copy of San Mateo's original building permit plan and it is believed that the garage is a part of the original construction.

Chair Parsons stated that he has no problem with the garage being part of the original construction but would like to find out what the access was behind all of those buildings. He believes there is probably a right-of-way easement driveway that runs behind all of the buildings and that was to be their access – not jumping into a Belmont residential neighborhood. He offered to meet with the San Mateo Planning Director to discuss this issue.

Other Reports:

CDD de Melo reported that the appeal that had been filed for **784 Miramar Terrace** has been withdrawn. Staff was able to get the appellant and applicant together to work on a mutual solution to that issue and both parties are now happy.

Chair Parsons, speaking for Belmont Heights, formally **thanked the Police Department** for apprehending the fire bug who had set two fires up in the hills, and added the hope that they could catch the burglar who has been in the neighborhood.

Chair Parsons asked that a fire inspector check out a **lot in the 2700 block of Belmont Canyon Road** that is overgrown with weeds.

Commissioner Frautschi raised the following issues:

- Two trees on the street at **Belmont Vista** have died and need to be replaced.
- There is a **Belmont Vista** sign at the end of Hill Street that he believes is on City property and probably should be removed.
- At Safeway on 6th Avenue, across from City Hall, one of the pear trees has died.
- At least four of the **new trees on Ralston** are dead that are not being watered enough. The Commission had been told that a problem with the irrigation would be fixed. Almost all of the plants at the **Folger Water Department** site have died except for the Oak trees. They need to go look at their site and come up with something else to plant there.
- Asked for an update for the Commission about **Shalizaar** landscaping. CDD de Melo reported that there was a requirement to plant an additional five to seven trees on the site. Walter Levison, City Arborist, had looked at the site and confirmed that the existing trees are healthy and doing a good job of screening the parking lot, but that there are a couple pockets where three to four trees could be planted. He had suggested Fruitless Olives. Staff will discuss this with the property owner and potentially arrange some sort of an in-lieu arrangement.

9. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2008

Liaison: Commissioner Mayer
Alternate Liaison: Chair Parsons

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, October 7, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. in Belmont City Hall.

Carlos de Melo
Planning Commission Secretary

*CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the
Community Development Department.*

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.